RECEIVED **CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

AUG 1 2 2005

PTQ/58/97 (09-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2008, OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Application Serial No. 10/681,587 Attorney Docket No. 56210.000019

Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office 571 273 8300

August 12, 2005 David P. McKim

Typed or printed name of person signing Certificate

Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of transmission, or this certificate must identify each submitted paper.

- 1. Communication to Patent Office Regarding Improper Inventorship (3 pages)
- 2. Revocation of Power of Attorney with New Power of Attorney and Change of Correspondence Address PTO/SB/82 (1 page)
- 3. Declaration of Thomas L. Barnhart with detailed qualification and employment history (6 pages)
- 4. Certificate of Transmission (1 page)

Total Pages:

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.8. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to life (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 36 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is essimated to take 1.9 minutes to complete including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete his form and/or suggestations for reducing his burden, should be some to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Officer, U.S. Department of Commerce. P.O. Box 1450, Alexandris, VA 22312-1450, DO NOT SEND FEEB OR COMPLETED FORMS TO This ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 1 2 2005

PATENT

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/681,587

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:)
Thomas L. Barnhart et al.) Examiner: Not yet known
Serial No. 10/681,587	Group Art Unit: Not yet known
Filed: October 7, 2003)
For: HIDDEN IMAGE GAME PIECE	
Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	

COMMUNICATION TO PATENT OFFICE REGARDING IMPROPER INVENTORSHIP

Dear Sir:

The subject patent application currently names two inventors, Thomas L. Barnhart ("Barnhart") and Joel M. Brooks ("Brooks"). This inventorship is improper. Barnhart and Brooks are co-inventors of United States Patent Nos. 5,984,367 ("the '367 patent") and 6,296,900 ("the '900 patent"). The subject application claims priority to both. The inventive contribution of the inventors of the '367 patent and the '900 patent — Barnhart and Brooks — are distinct, yet complimentary of the inventions claimed therein.

At the time of the invention of the '367 patent (the parent to the '900 patent), Barnhart was very experienced in promotions and marketing strategies and had many years of experience working with companies to devise creative marketing and promotional strategies, including those involving hidden image game pieces. However, at that time, Barnhart was not as experienced in complex printing techniques. Consequently, Barnhart sought the assistance of a printing

professional and found Brooks. At that time, Brooks was employed by Williams Printing of Atlanta, Georgia. Brooks assisted Barnhart with developing the details of printing the hidden image game piece as disclosed and claimed in the '367 patent and the '900 patent. The claims of the '367 patent embody both of their respective inventive contributions and, consequently, Barnhart and Brooks are properly named as co-inventors.

In stark contrast, the claims of the subject patent application, as well as those in U.S. Patent No. 6,629,888 ("the '888 patent"), which names Barnhart as the sole inventor, are directed to a method for increasing website traffic without any regard whatsoever to the printing techniques disclosed in the '888 patent, i.e., Brooks' inventive contribution — printing techniques — is not claimed in the '888 patent. Thus, it was proper in the '888 patent not to include Brooks as a co-inventor of the '888 patent, and in fact, it would have been improper to do so. In the subject application, all of the claims, like those in the '888 patent, are directed to a method for increasing website traffic, without any regard whatsoever to the disclosed printing techniques. Consequently, like the '888 patent, it is improper to include Brooks as an inventor in the subject application.

Enclosed herewith is a Declaration of Thomas L. Barnhart stating that he conceived the invention claimed in the subject application and thus is the sole inventor of the claims pending in the subject application. Also enclosed herewith is Form PTO/SB/82, a Revocation by Thomas L. Barnhart of Sanford J. Asman's power of attorney and Appointment of the undersigned counsel with full authority to appear and prosecute the subject application on behalf of the sole inventor, Thomas L. Barnhart. Finally, because Thomas L. Barnhart is the sole inventor of the claimed invention, also enclosed herewith is a change of correspondence address.

PATENT

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/681,587

The applicant at this time is not submitting herewith a petition to correct inventorship because the proper applicant, Thomas Barnhart, is without sufficient knowledge of the underlying facts to aver that Sanford J. Asman (Reg. No. 26,251), who filed the subject patent application, did not without deceptive intent include Joel M. Brooks as a co-inventor of the subject patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

ed: 8/12/2005

Hunton & Williams LLP 1900 K Street, N.W., Suite 1200 Washington, D.C. 20006-1109 (703) 714-7553 (Telephone) (703) 714-7410 (Facsimile) By: